UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
26th meeting
held on
Thursday, 5 November 1992
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.26
4 December 1992

ENGLISH

92-61762 2619V (E)

In the absence of the Chairman, Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 11.05 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65; 68 and 142; and 67 and 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the Russian Federation, Mr. Batsanov, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.10.

Mr. BATSANOV (Russian Federation) (interpretation from Russian): I should like to take this opportunity to express our satisfaction at the election of Mr. Elaraby of Egypt as Chairman of the First Committee and at his success in conducting the work of the Committee.

I am glad to present, on behalf of the delegations of Belgium, Canada and Sweden, as well as the delegation of the Russian Federation, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.10 entitled "Prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of radiological weapons".

This year at the Conference on Disarmament the delegation of the Russian Federation had the honour of chairing the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons. As representatives are aware, it was a special year for the Conference on Disarmament. Major efforts were concentrated on the development of the Convention on chemical weapons. Accordingly, as is noted in the report of the Conference to the United Nations General Assembly, negotiations in the Conference concentrated on the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons, while the workload of other subsidiary bodies was lighter than in previous years.

This comment about workload applies to the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons. Nevertheless, some positive work was done

(Mr. Batsanov, Russian Federation)

within the framework of that Committee, and this has helped to clarify outstanding issues with regard both to the development of the draft convention on the prohibition of radiological weapons and to the prohibition of attacks against nuclear facilities. The work in these two areas was directed by Mr. Dimitrijevic of Yugoslavia and Mr. Ausman of Canada respectively, to both of whom I should like to express profound appreciation for their contribution to the work of the Ad Hoc Committee this year.

At the same time I consider it necessary to note that, when summing up the results of the Ad Hoc Committee's work this summer, a number of delegations raised the question of the need for new approaches to the solution of basic problems involved in our negotiations - problems that had emerged many years ago. As a result, the recommendation concerning the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Radiological Weapons at the beginning of the 1993 session of the Conference on Disarmament stressed the need for the Ad Hoc Committee to be given guidance on reviewing the organization of its work with the aim of fulfilling its mandate.

The draft resolution that we are submitting today, like earlier ones, is quite simple. It reflects the work that was carried out during the year, and it takes note of the new elements in the recommendation concerning the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee, which I have just mentioned.

On behalf of all of the sponsors of the draft resolution, I express the hope that the First Committee and, subsequently, the General Assembly will find it possible to adopt the text by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Qatar, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9.

Mr. AL-NASSER (Qatar) (interpretation from Arabic): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9 on behalf of the following delegations: Algeria, Bahrain, Djibouti, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritania, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen. The draft resolution deals with agenda item 64, entitled "Israeli nuclear armament".

The draft resolution before the Committee today is based on previous resolutions adopted on this subject, the latest of which was last year's General Assembly resolution 46/39, in which the General Assembly called for placing all nuclear facilities in the region under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, pending the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

The preamble also notes with grave concern Israel's persistent refusal to commit itself not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons, thus threatening international peace and security.

In its operative part the draft resolution deplores Israel's refusal to renounce possession of nuclear weapons; urges it to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty, promptly to apply Security Council resolution 487 (1981) and to place all its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. It further calls upon all States and organizations not to cooperate with or give assistance to Israel in any way that could enhance its nuclear-weapons capability. It requests the IAEA to inform the Secretary-General of any steps

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

Israel may take to place its nuclear facilities under Agency safeguards, and requests the Secretary-General to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session.

Allow me to say that the Council of Ministers of the League of Arab States when last they met in September of this year in Cairo, called upon the arms-exporting countries and countries parties to the NPT to do everything possible to make all the States of the Middle East place their nuclear facilities under the control of the IAEA. The Council of Ministers of the League of Arab States also called for turning the Middle East into a nuclear-weapon-free zone, a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction, nuclear, chemical and biological alike, taking into consideration the Arab countries welcoming attitude toward all efforts that ensure security through equitable and legally binding obligations in the area of disarmament providing that such obligations are applied even-handedly according to a single standard, to all the States of the region, including Israel which has refused, to this date, to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty or to take any steps to that end.

In conclusion, we call upon all Member States to support the sponsors by voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9 and thus display their sense of responsibility and enhance the Organization's credibility without any discrimination or selectivity by insisting on Israel's compliance with United Nations resolutions and the norms of international law. By so doing, the

(Mr. Al-Nasser, Qatar)

Member States will further the cause of international peace and security, while at the same time serving the cause of development, stability and peace in our region.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Colombia who will introduce draft decision A/C.1/47/L.3.

Miss CABALLERO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): Last year the First Committee adopted without a vote the draft resolution that became General Assembly resolution 46/36 H, entitled "International arms transfers". Today, on behalf of the delegations of Colombia and Peru, we are introducing draft decision A/C.1/47/L.3, entitled "International arms transfers".

The Colombian delegation regards the strengthening of international collective security as a priority, especially in the light of the challenges posed by the changing geopolitical and geoeconomic scene. If this collective security we strive for so much is not based on the widest participation and approval of the concert of nations, it will simply be the instrument of a selective and partial regime dictated by the interests of a few, leaving aside the needs of the many.

The successful development of programme or initiatives in the field of disarmament requires globalization and democratization of the decision-making and negotiating processes, as well as of the instruments we design. No multilateral treaty for disarmament or reduction of armaments agreed upon to date has come fully into force. Is it not time to ask ourselves why that is so and what we must do to attain this final goal?

(Miss Caballero, Colombia)

We believe that the will to make headway in the field of disarmament exists so long as the concerns and needs of all the participants are taken into consideration in order to achieve true consensus. The successful finalization of the Convention on the prohibition of chemical weapons proves this. Many have already pointed out that it should become our model as we tackle other spheres - as a priority, nuclear weapons. None the less, we cannot lose sight of the fact that the Convention will be truly effective only when it is ratified by all nations. But it is an important step in the right direction: a clear instance in which the value of the globalization of the negotiating process has been proved.

Aware that participation by the largest possible number of countries in the work we undertake is indispensable, the delegations of Peru and Colombia have decided to introduce a draft decision this year on international arms transfers. We believe it is advisable to grant more time to those States which have not yet done so to reply to the invitation contained in operative paragraphs 5 and 6 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 H. Many delegations, including mine, have already replied; their replies are contained in documents A/47/183, A/47/314 and A/47/314/Add.1. Therefore, we consider it indispensable that the item "International arms transfers" be included in the provisional agenda of the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

(Miss Caballero, Colombia)

The official policies on arms procurement and arms transfer complement the progress achieved so far in the promotion of transparency. Similarly, the control of arms transfers will make a definite contribution to deterrence of the proliferation of conventional weapons, a phenomenon which, in its turn, is fed by the vast illicit traffic in weapons. We will not be able to lay the foundations for lasting peace so long as we do not search for a solution to these scourges. For this reason, my delegation calls upon all Member States to support this draft decision.

We emphasize the need to achieve a global perspective and to strengthen multilateral approaches, which are indispensable for our work. The Disarmament Commission, as a forum open to all States, must tackle the fundamental problems in the field of disarmament: arms transfers and the question of proliferation. These are matters which can benefit only from open dialogue between countries. They are matters that can make headway only when we can count on the support and will of all nations. The Disarmament Commission is a vital body, the only one that offers us an opportunity to become familiar with the concerns and interests of all nations. Without these elements of judgement it is difficult for us to make any progress towards our stated - even if Utopian - ultimate goal: general and complete disarmament.

We believe that we must strive to strengthen and revitalize the Disarmament Commission in order that it may be able to carry on substantive discussions on subjects of vital importance. We believe that the work we are carrying on is a decisive contribution to the progress made in the various disarmament bodies. My delegation supports unconditionally the inclusion of a new item in the agenda of the Disarmament Commission for 1993.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call upon the representative of Canada, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42.

Ms. MASON (Canada): In submitting draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42, under agenda item 52, "Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification", I am joined by sponsors from the following countries: Australia, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, India, Italy, Japan, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Samoa, Spain and Sweden.

In my statement to the First Committee at its 6th meeting, on 15 October, I indicated that Canada intended to submit a draft resolution on verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification. We had originally envisaged that the resolution would have two main themes. First, the resolution would take note of the Secretary-General's report (A/47/405) of 16 September 1992 on actions taken to implement the recommendations in the 1990 Group of Experts study on verification and would reiterate the call for assistance by Member States in implementing them.

Secondly, we had hoped to go beyond this to call for a follow-on study by a United Nations group of experts that would explore new developments that had taken place since 1990, which we believe warrant exploration in relation to a useful United Nations role in verification. The mandate we proposed for this follow-on study would have focused on two topics: first, the preliminary practical lessons from recent United Nations experience in the United Nations

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

Special Commission , as well as other international developments relating to verification, for United Nations verification activities, and, secondly, how the verification of arms limitation and disarmament agreements could facilitate United Nations activities with respect to preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict peace-building.

Subsequent to that statement, in the course of further consultations with other delegations, it has become clear that there does not exist sufficient support within this Committee to proceed with such a study by a group of experts at this time.

Canada continues to believe that the activities of the United Nations Special Commission and of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have very real and useful conceptual and operational lessons to teach us with regard to verification in general, verification in other arms limitation and disarmament areas and with regard to United Nations activities in this field. We do not suggest that this experience can be transferred direct to other areas or that it could serve as a model for future United Nations activities, but it can provide valuable insights of both a positive and a negative nature.

One particular advantage, as Canada sees it, of the proposed study would be wider dissemination of information about a variety of United Nations activities relating to verification, including those mandated by the Security Council. It would therefore help the broader international community to participate in a meaningful way in discussions of the direction in which the United Nations is going, and indeed should go, in the field of verification.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

It has also been suggested that the last study by a group of experts was completed only two years ago and that it is therefore premature to do another. In response to this, we can only point to the astounding changes that have taken place in the international system since 1990. We all know that these changes have meant a remarkable renewed interest in the importance of the United Nations in the field of security. Heightened peacekeeping demands are but one example. The Secretary General's report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) is a valuable attempt to come to grips with these changes and to suggest a way forward for the United Nations. We had hoped that in a much smaller way, the proposed follow-on study by a group of experts could have contributed positively to this dialogue.

As I indicated earlier, Canada has decided not to press ahead at this time with its proposal for a follow-on study by a group of experts on verification. We will, nevertheless, proceed with submission of a draft resolution on the subject, which I would like to explain briefly.

The preambular paragraphs of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42, on verification, which is being submitted today, draw heavily on earlier consensus resolutions on the subject. New elements include language relating to the impact of recent developments in international relations on verification. In addition to noting that these developments have underscored the importance of verification, the draft also indicates that some of these developments have significant effects on the role of the United Nations in this field.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

In other new preambular paragraphs the General Assembly would take note of two of these recent international developments; the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" and the Final Declaration of the Third Review Conference of the biological and toxin weapons Convention. In the final preambular paragraph the General Assembly would recall some of the operative paragraphs of resolution 45/65, the last resolution on verification, which was adopted by consensus in 1990.

At this point I would like to explain that we have had a suggestion for an additional preambular paragraph which would follow the eighth preambular paragraph. My delegation and some others support the suggestion, and we are in the process of contacting all of the sponsors to get their views. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read out the text of the proposed suggestion, which would come after the eighth preambular paragraph:

> "Welcoming the conclusion of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, which contains an unprecedented regime of verification".

In the first two operative paragraphs of the draft resolution the General Assembly would take note of the report of the Secretary General (A/47/405) of 16 September 1992, which was prepared pursuant to resolution 45/65 and which echoes the call contained in that earlier resolution for Member States to give active consideration to the recommendations in the 1990 study of the Group of Experts and to assist the Secretary-General in their implementation.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

In operative paragraph 3 the Secretary-General would suggest - as a follow-up to the 1990 study and in view of significant developments in international relations since that study - seeking the views of Member States concerning three matters: first, additional actions that might be taken to implement the recommendations contained in the 1990 study; secondly, how the verification of arms limitation and disarmament agreements could facilitate United Nations activities with respect to preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peace-keeping and post-conflict peace-building; and thirdly, additional actions with respect to the role of the United Nations in the field of verification, including further studies by the United Nations on this subject.

(Ms. Mason, Canada)

In operative paragraph 4 the Secretary-General would be asked to report on this subject to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session. In the final operative paragraph the General Assembly would decide to include the subject in the agenda of its forty-eighth session.

Canada continues to believe that verification remains as relevant today as it was at any time in the past. Significant developments have taken place in the international system since the completion of the 1990 study on verification, developments that provide important opportunities for the further consideration of a useful United Nations role in verification.

We believe that this new draft resolution is a fair compromise of the various views on how to proceed on this subject. If adopted, the measures it contains will provide a useful step forward in the consideration by the United Nations of verification in all its aspects.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Sweden to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21 concerning the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, often referred to as the United Nations conventional weapons Convention.

A resolution regarding that Convention has been approved without a vote a number of times since the Convention was opened for signature in April 1981, with the Secretary-General of the United Nations designated as its depositary. Three Protocols are annexed to the Convention, namely the Protocol on Non-Detectable Fragments (Protocol I), another on Prohibitions or Restrictions

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II) and a third Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons (Protocol III). The Convention with its three annexed Protocols is an essential international agreement designed to place constraints upon the conduct of war. It is part of a tradition of international humanitarian law in armed conflicts, which in its modern form is expressed in article 35 of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The relevant paragraph of that article states:

> "It is prohibited to employ weapons, projectiles and material and methods of warfare of a nature to cause superfluous injury or unnecessary suffering."

The 1980 Convention represents an important development of the body of international humanitarian law in armed conflicts through restricting the use of certain conventional weapons. As is stated in a preambular paragraph to the Convention, the positive results achieved in this area may also facilitate disarmament work with a view to putting an end to the production, stockpiling and proliferation of such weapons.

The 1980 conventional weapons Convention entered into force in December 1983 after the ratification of the Convention by 20 States. The number of States bound by the Convention has since then increased, but is, according to the report of the Secretary-General on the status of multilateral disarmament agreements of 12 October 1992 - document A/47/470 and Add.1 - even today not more than 33. Thus, in the draft resolution the General Assembly would note the need for wider ratification of the Convention and the three annexed Protocols and would urge States that have not yet acceded to the Convention and its three Protocols to exert their best endeavours to become

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

parties as early as possible, with a view ultimately to universal adherence. The Assembly would also note the potential of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) to consider questions pursuant to the Convention.

The sponsors of the draft resolution are Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Iceland, India, Ireland, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Russian Federation, Viet Nam and my own country, Sweden.

On behalf of the sponsors I would like to express the hope that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.21 will be adopted without a vote.

Speaking on behalf of my own delegation, I should like to add the following comments.

On 2 December 1993, 10 years will have elapsed since the entry into force of the Convention. According to article 8, paragraph 3 (a), any State party may after that period request the depositary to convene a conference to review the scope and operation of the Convention and its Protocols. Such a Conference may also agree upon amendments to the Convention and its Protocols and may consider the need for additional Protocols relating to other categories of conventional weapons not covered by the existing Protocols. A conference of this kind may also be held before 10 years have elapsed after the entry into force of the Convention if a majority of the States Parties so agree. In the view of Sweden it would now be timely to consult interested delegations on the appropriateness of such a conference to be held in the near future.

In the opinion of my country, incendiary weapons should be made subject to further specific restrictions. It is also our view that naval mines should be the object of restrictions within the framework of the Convention. A draft

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Naval Mines was submitted by my delegation last year and circulated in document A/C.1/46/15. The draft Protocol is elaborated on the basis of the concepts of neutralizing mechanisms and information, concepts already incorporated in the Eighth Hague Convention on Automatic Submarine Contact Mines and in Protocol II, attached to the United Nations conventional weapons Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices.

In addition, developments in laser technology should be followed closely. As my delegation stated earlier in this forum, there is a clear risk of the development of lasers for anti-personnel purposes on the conventional battlefield. It is technically possible to develop and manufacture specific laser weapons, the main effect of which would be to blind the adversary's soldiers permanently. Such anti-eye laser weapons may yield certain military advantages but on balance, taking into account humanitarian considerations, it seems that such lasers should be subject to prohibitions or to restrictions on their use either in a new protocol annexed to the United Nations Convention or by some other means. Swedish experts have continuously consulted with other experts in the field during the last few years and have participated in several expert meetings, many of them organized by the International Committee of the Red Cross. As a result, the ICRC has published a number of reports on battlefield laser weapons, the latest in April 1991. The reports of the meetings of experts will, according to the statement made last week by the representative of the ICRC during the general debate, be published in one volume at the beginning of 1993.

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

Two Swedish experts, together with a United States professor of biomedical engineering, have also published a scientific article entitled "Blinding laser weapons and international humanitarian law". Copies of that article are available in this conference room.

Sweden attaches great importance to the further development of international humanitarian law in armed conflicts. The United Nations has declared the 1990s to be the United Nations Decade of International Law. It would be appropriate to fill this Decade with concrete action and agreements also within the field of humanitarian law in the spirit of the Hague Conventions on the laws of warfare of 1907. A well-prepared review conference of the 1980 United Nations conventional weapons Convention could serve as a means to enhance progress in this field. My delegation would be willing to consult with any other interested delegation on this matter.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): My colleague from Sweden has just introduced draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21, concerning the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to be Excessivelv Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects.

The Convention merits our particular attention, now even more than it did in the past.

Many States today are deeply involved in operations which bring them into daily contact with the suffering of civilians. It is civilians who suffer most from conflicts in which weapons described in the Convention are used. This can be witnessed daily in Cambodia, Somalia and the former Yugoslavia.

The word "indiscriminate" in the title of the Convention applies to the peasant who activates a trip wire on his land or to the child who picks up a toy which explodes.

The so-called CUSHIE weapons not only cause excessive injuries or have indiscriminate effects on human beings: they also cause the elimination of biological diversity and the degradation of the environment.

The Convention applies to present-day reality, not to an academic notion or a theory.

For years the Netherlands has appealed to States to adhere to the Convention. It has a particular advantage in so far as it induces States to reflect on the military effectiveness of certain weapons and to offset this effectiveness against humanitarian considerations. These weapons used in an internal conflict become weapons of terror for civilians. It is therefore with a sense of urgency that my delegation again appeals to States to adhere to the Convention. Universal adherence would compel States not to use such weapons any more in a military conflict and it would at the same time make it

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

more difficult for such weapons to be used in internal conflicts against civilians. The prohibition of certain types of weapons will make their requisition more difficult.

Last but not least, universal adherence to the Convention will strengthen its international authority and thus highlight its obvious benefits for mankind. In this context, I wish to draw attention to the impetus which a review conference could give to furthering the objectives of the Convention. As representatives are aware, a review conference can be convened 10 years after the entry into force of the Convention, which means that such a conference could be held in 1993. By inviting as many States as possible to attend the conference, either as a State party or in the capacity of observer, we could promote international recognition of the value of the Convention as a vital tool of the humanitarian laws of war. Furthermore, a review of the present operation of the Convention may help clarify the scope for, and the desirability of, its further development. The Netherlands would be willing to engage in the necessary consultations leading to the holding of a review conference in 1993.

In the meantime, the Netherlands believes that the text of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21 will commend itself to the Committee for adoption by consensus, as a first step towards appropriate stengthening of the Convention.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): As one of its sponsors, Ireland supports the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.21, on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. This draft resolution has just been introduced by the representative of Sweden.

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

The Convention on Inhumane Weapons - to use the shorter title by which it is known - was signed in 1981. It represented a major development in the efforts to lay down rules of a humanitarian nature in the matter of prohibiting or restricting excessively inhumane means and methods of warfare. It is an indication of the commitment of the international community to developing international humanitarian law in the field of conventional weaponry.

The Convention did not establish any verification rules, though my delegation and others suggested, during the negotiations leading to the conclusion of the Convention, the establishment of a consultative committee of experts to investigate alleged violations of the Protocols to the Convention. My delegation continues to believe that such a consultative committee would help increase the trust and confidence of States in the implementation of the Convention and would thus help strengthen it and promote universal adherence to it.

The representative of Sweden has drawn attention to the provisions of the Convention in relation to reviewing the scope and operation of the Convention and its Protocols. A conference convened for that purpose could also consider the issue of additional protocols to include categories of weapons not covered at present. My delegation supports the suggestion made by the representative of Sweden that delegations hold consultations on this issue.

Finally, my delegation shares the concern expressed about developments in laser technology and supports the suggestion that consideration be given to imposing prohibitions or restrictions on the use of some of these weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the representative of France, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30.

(Mr. Errera, France)

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30, and also to refer to agenda item 65 and draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30, on the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR), is sponsored by Austria, Cameroon, Costa Rica, Egypt, Germany, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Nepal, the Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka and France.

As representatives will recall, the General Assembly at its forty-fifth session, aaopted without a vote resolution 45/62 G, which had been introduced on the occasion of UNIDIR's tenth anniversary.

(Mr. Errera, France)

After recognizing in that resolution:

> "the increased importance and high quality of the work of the Institute in the execution of its mandate under its Statute", (resolution 45/62 G, para. 2)

the General Assembly requested the Institute to prepare, with the assistance of independent experts, a research report on the economic aspects of disarmament.

That report was transmitted to the General Assembly by the Secretary-General in document A/47/346. The study was carried out with the assistance of non-governmental experts of international standing from the following countries: Egypt, France, India, Mexico, the Netherlands, the Russian Federation, Sweden, United Kingdom and United States, with the participation of the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The experts adopted their report by consensus.

The growing importance of the subject covered by the UNIDIR research report is acknowledged by the international community, the general debate in this Committee has shown. We feel that UNIDIR's conclusions merit study by the Governments of Member States.

That is why draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.30 welcomes the research report and commends it to the attention of Member States. It encourages them to give active consideration, in particular, to the economic principles for disarmament contained in the executive summary of the report.

The sponsors of the draft resolution hope it will be adopted without a vote.

I would now like, as I stated earlier, to turn to agenda item 65. The French delegation is happy to support the Swedish delegation, which introduced

(Mr. Errera, France)

draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.21 on the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventioal Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. France is a sponsor of the draft resolution.

France is happy to note that a growing number of States have acceded to the 1980 Convention, although the number of States Parties is still too small. The most recent armed conflicts have proved, if proof were needed that humanitarian law must be rigorously applied and strengthened. Civilian populations are generally the first victims of the use of certain weapons, including anti-personnel mines. To respond to this grave problem, raised here by the representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), France hopes for a renewal of the process aiming at strict control of such weapons.

To this end, France above all supports the initiative of the Swiss Government to convene in the first three months of 1993 a conference on the application of humanitarian law, and it will request that the subject of anti-personnel mines be given priority attention.

Moreover, in accordance with article 8 of the 1980 Convention, France has decided to request that amendments be made to the Convention. It proposes a revision of Protocol II, on prohibition or restrictions on the use of mines, booby traps and other devices, and the addition to it of provisions on the verification of matters that might constitute infringements of undertakings.

France is therefore preparing to request the Secretary-General, as depositary of the 1980 Convention, to convene of an amendment conference during 1993.

(Mr. Errera, France)

To return to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23, my delegation associates itself with the wish expressed by the representative of Sweden that it be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: As the Committee is aware, this year a total of two draft decisions and 40 draft resolutions - in other words, 42 draft proposals - have been tabled under the various disarmament agenda items. In accordance with the Committee's programme of work and timetable, the Committee will begin taking action on those draft decisions and resolutions on Thursday, 12 November. A total of 10 meetings has been allocated for this phase of the Committee's work, which will last until 18 November.

In this connection, members will recall that at the organizational meeting of the Commitee on 8 October the Chairman stated his intention of following the useful device of clustering draft resolutions, which has evolved over the past several years. A meeting of the officers of the Committee is scheduled for this afternoon to address the matter. The Chairman will be in a position to provide the Committee early next week with a paper grouping together draft resolutions in several clusters, with a view to facilitating the Committee's task at the stage of taking action on the draft proposals.

On another matter, I should like to inform representatives that at an informal open-ended meeting of the Group of Friends of the Chairman, which was held on Tuesday, 3 November, the representative of Indonesia proposed that an official meeting of the First Committee should be devoted specifically to consideration of the report of the Secretary-General submitted under agenda item 63 (f), the report entitled "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold war era" (A/C.1/47/7). I would like to

(The Chairman)

add that the proposal received broad support at that meeting. I therefore suggest that the morning meeting on Wednesday, 11 November, be allocated to consideration of the report of the Secretary-General. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to allocate that meeting for consideration of that report.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: Accordingly, I request delegations wishing to speak at the special meeting next Wednesday to enter their names for that purpose on the list of speakers.

A number of representatives have approached the Chair concerning an extension of the deadline for submission of draft resolutions under international security agenda items, items 67 and 69. The officers of the First Committee have reviewed the matter and as a result of their review I suggest that the deadline for the submission of draft resolutions under international security items be extended to Tuesday, 10 November, at 6 p.m. to enable the representatives concerned to conclude their consultations.

If I hear no objections, I shall take it that the proposed deadline is acceptable to the Committee.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.1: Guinea-Bissau and Sierra Leone;

A/C.1/47/L.5: Kenya and Cameroon;

A/C.1/47/L.15: Spain and Chile;

A/C.1/47/L.22: Iceland;

A/C.1/47/L.24: United Arab Emirates;

A/C.1/47/L.25: United States of America;

A/C.1/47/L.26: Indonesia;

A/C.1/47/L.29: Estonia;

A/C.1/47/L.32: Bhutan;

A/C.1/47/L.33: Bhutan;

A/C.1/47/L.35: Estonia;

A/C.1/47/L.36: Belgium;

A/C.1/47/L.40: United States of America;

A/C.1/47/L.42: India and Cameroon.

I should like also to draw the attention of representatives to the fact that we have made available to them copies of two publications prepared by the Office for Disarmament Affairs following two conferences that were organized this year: Topical Papers 9: The Asia-Pacific Region: Non-Proliferation and Other Disarmament Issues, which contains material presented at a meeting held at the United Nations Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the

(The Secretary)

Pacific in Katmandu, Nepal, from 27 to 29 January 1992; and Topical Papers 10: Non-Proliferation and Confidence-building Measures in Asia and the Pacific, which contains material presented at a conference held in Hiroshima, Japan, from 15 to 18 June 1992. Additional copies of these two publications are available in this Conference Room.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.